UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,057 11/25/2003		Sven Bernhard	11884/408001	4191
53000 KENYON & K	7590 01/22/200 ENYON LLP	EXAMINER		
1500 K STREE	T N.W.	HOANG, PHUONG N		
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20003		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2194	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/22/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/720,057	BERNHARD ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	FITOONS IN. HOANS	2194	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 December 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Arno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (IMONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor	•	ΓE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
appeal; and/or	arrage and in a number of finally rais	atad alaima	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	ected ciaims.	
_	21 See attached Nation of Nan Co.	mpliant Amandment (	DTOL 224)
= '		mpilant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
<ul><li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li><li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all</li></ul>		imaly filed emendmen	ot concoling the
non-allowable claim(s).	owabie ii submilled iii a separale, i	linely filed afficitioner	it canceling the
7. A For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 - 14, 16 - 20</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
<ul> <li>11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> <li>12. Note the extraphed Information Displaceurs Statement(s).</li> </ul>		i condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	F 1 0/30/00/ Paper NO(S)		
	/Li B. Zhen/		
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2194	
	<i>,</i> , ,		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argued that

- 1. As to claim 1, Dinallo fails to teach "upon receipt of a request ...identifying a peripheral device capable of performing a specific feature corresponding to the feature request" and "executing the native driver of the identified peripheral device". The cited abstract only is generally inappropriate. In response, applicant conflicted in the argument. Applicant acknowledged that examiner cited both abstract and col. 5 lines 2 25. When the request is received (col. 5 lines 1 10), when DDInterface identifies the device when it receives data buffer from OO subsystem and calls DDTransport to start the device (col. 5 lines 30 65). The start command is to execute the native driver of the selected device (col. 5 lines 40 50). Applicant argued that there is only one device driver that is currently communicating. In response, DDInterface can communicate to other device drivers other than the device driver with which DDInterface is presently communicating (col. 5 lines 5 10). When the DDInterface would like to select the identifying device, it sends the start command to the device as responded above.
- 2. As to claim 14, Edmonds does not teach "generic driver interface calls a plurality of generic routines the casue the native driver to execute and control the peripheral device". In response, The generic driver interface is the native driver installed on mobile device (0023). When it create or generate a print job for an appropriate printer-independent postcript for any supported printer, it has to call plurality of generic routines (0024).
- 3. As to claim 12, Edmonds does not teach the step of "instantiates a connection classs....device". In response, examiner did not cite Edmonds for teaching instatiates a connection class. It is the combination of Dinallo in view of Edmonds, not any alone, teaches the claimed limitations. See the final rejection above. Examiner cited Dinallo for teaching a connection class including generic routines to connect to peripheral devices (DDinterface class is a base class, title, abstract, figure 3 and associated text, col. 4) the generic routines being independent of device-specific features of the peripheral devices (abstract interface maintain device independence, figures 2 and 6 and associated text) receiving a request to access one of the peripheral devices (request, col. 5 lines

Edmonds teaches "connecting, through the native driver of the requested peripheral device to execute (the printer driver receives the user-selected printer, the user's print job is directed to that printer, 0007, 0009, 0015, 0022).

2